

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration in view of the here with presented amendment and remarks is respectfully requested.

Amendments were made to the specification to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants have amended the claims such that claim 1 now includes the limitations of claims 2 and 7 and applies to “a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit and a rack.” This amendment is supported in the Specification on page 1, lines 9-10. As claimed the invention encompasses the application in which the original problem was raised, that is, fixing an inertial unit to a rack by means of a plurality (or a number) of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve, and to a preferred embodiment disclosed in the detailed description of this application.

The entire description of the invention (the background, the summary and the detailed description) refers to the fixation of an inertial unit (11) to a rack (10) (see Fig. 3). This is the field in which the problem was raised, and this is why applicant has focused the scope of this claimed invention to this particular application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Amended claim 1 includes the characteristics of original claim 1, in order to make it clear that the structure enabling the compensation of the clearance in the sleeve is the posterior fixing part of the peg being greater than the diameter of the sleeve, and the peg being slotted. This had been fully discussed in the previous Office Action and the application hereby includes

these characteristics as that “it is clearly presented in the claim”, as required by the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,630,983 to Fisher (“Fisher Patent”).

Fisher relates to an expansion pin for clamping an article to a piece of masonry.

Firstly, the pin of Fisher Patent is not implemented in a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of an inertial unit to a rack, as presently claimed.

Secondly, the pin is not part of a the article being fixed (the pin is driven into the hole by “hammer blows” (column 3, line 68 – column 4, line 1). The invention applies to the fixation of an inertial unit to a rack, the fixing means comprising a plurality of assemblies of a peg and of a sleeve of the inertial unit and the rack. The problem solved in particular to this plurality of assemblies, the pegs and sleeves being part of the inertial unit and the rack, while in Fisher Patent the objective is to drive a pin in a hole.

Thirdly, the function of the expanding region of the pin of the Fisher Patent is to compensate for the tolerance in the drilled hole, while in the invention the function of the posterior part of the peg is to compensate for the clearance in the sleeve, which is linked, as explained in the description, to the “manufacturing tolerances” as to the coaxiality of the peg and sleeve of each assembly, in the context of the fixation of an inertial unit to a rack. This functional difference is confirmed by the second function of the expanding region of the pin of the Fisher Patent, which is to secure the article to the piece of masonry, while in the present invention the securing “in terms of translation” is obtained by “a locking system that is independent of the pegs”.

Consequently, the applicant believes that the invention as newly claimed in claim

1 is not being anticipated by the Fisher Patent.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Fisher Patent in view of U.S. 3,962,775 to King, Jr. (“King Patent”). Claim 8 has been cancelled. Claim 7 is in the dependency of new claim 1, which we have seen is believed not to be anticipated by Fisher Patent

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the present claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

AUTHORIZATION

If the Examiner believes that issues may be resolved by telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned at (212) 801-2146. The undersigned may also be contacted by e-mail at ecr@gtlaw.com.

No additional fee is believed to be necessary. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1561.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 50-1561.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 9, 2005

By: Eugene C. Rzucidlo
Eugene C. Rzucidlo
Registration No. 31,900
Customer Number: 32361